



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,564	07/02/2003	Dennis R. Berman	TRV03-0001	5486
28422	7590	10/29/2008		
HOYT A. FLEMING III			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 140678			GISHNOCK, NIKOLAI A	
BOISE, ID 83714				
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3715		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/29/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/613,564

Applicant(s)

BERMAN, DENNIS R.

Examiner

Nikolai A. Gishnock

Art Unit

3715

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 53-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 53-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/11/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

In response to Applicant's reply filed 8/11/2008, claims 1-52 are cancelled. Claims 53-73 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/11/2008 has been entered.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 3715

3. Claims 53-73 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-36 of U.S. Patent No. 7,357,640 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims teach a method comprising displaying a question and an answer to the question, the answer comprising a keyword having characters, where the characters are displayed by font depending upon their specific order of receipt and correctness.
4. Claims 53-73 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 75-110 of copending Application No. 11/924,844. See reasons given in paragraph 3 above. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.
5. Claims 53-73 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-37 of copending Application No. 11/925,234. See reasons given in paragraph 3 above. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 53-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 53 & 65 contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the Applicant, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation, "wherein no characters are entered into the keyboard by the

Art Unit: 3715

learner in between the first received character entered into the keyboard by the learner and the second received character entered into the keyboard by the learner", is not conveyed to one skilled in the art on the basis of paragraphs 0020-21 of the specification, because such a negative limitation does not have a basis in the original disclosure. Thus, it is unclear from the specification that this limitation was in Applicant's possession at the time of filing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. Claims 53-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziv-El (US 6,302,698 B1), hereinafter known as Ziv-El.

11. Ziv-El teaches a method for training a learner to memorize the answer to a question (The present invention provides for a teaching strategy where the students are given a question in a frame, which requires them to respond both in the form of an answer which is automatically scored by the system, as well as with an explanation which can be subjectively evaluated by the teacher, 4:10-15), the answer to the question including a keyword having at least 2 characters

Art Unit: 3715

(alternative answers 18:49-65; the answers "uneasy", "fidgety", or "reckless" are understood to have at least two characters), the method performed by a computer system having a processor, a memory, a keyboard, and a display (an on-line teaching and learning system according to the invention, including a teacher's computer and five student computers. The teacher's computer includes an input device (such as a keyboard, a mouse or similar means for selecting a character or an item on a screen as well as bar code reader apparatus, by which characters can be read and input to simulate keystrokes on a keyboard) and an output device, in this example, a 17-inch color monitor. In this description, the term "computer" shall mean an item of equipment including a central processor, a memory, at least one input device and at least one output device, 5:41-52), the method comprising: presenting on the display, utilizing a graphical user interface, the question and the answer to the question (The teacher's class response window applies to frame of a single lesson, as indicated by (1 lesson) on Response button. The name of the lesson is English 5 as shown. The Question/Summary and the Answer(s) remind the teacher of what the authored frame is all about, while the teacher examines the dynamic screen below, as the students are responding, 22:42-49; Response Screen, (also referred to as the responses view), which is the result of pressing the Response button after the students have already started to respond. The screen is dynamic since it is updated while students type on their keyboards. The two top rows of buttons, as well as the Question/Summary field, are virtually the same as the Frame Content User Interface, 22:20-41; see also 18:49-65, the question "Give synonym of 'Restive'. Explain meaning or use 'restive' in a sentence." is written in the Student Display area, while the message "You have 30 minutes for this quiz. NO TALKING PLEASE" is written in the Class Display area. The Answers to the question, if there are more than one, are entered by typing into data entry/display area and adding it to the list of Answers by actuating the Add button; see also Figure 8); presenting on the display, utilizing the

Art Unit: 3715

graphical user interface, a prompt to answer the question; then, receiving a first received character entered into the keyboard by the learner; then, receiving a second received character entered into the keyboard by the learner (FIG. 11 is a view of a student's screen for a Fill-in-the-blanks type of exercise. The cursor initially comes to rest in the first blank space to be filled in, as shown by the ">" symbol. When the student finishes fitting in the first answer in the space for Atlantic, he or she presses the tab key or clicks with the mouse on the space for Pacific and fills in the second response, etc. Each student response is compared and evaluated, character-by-character at the time of typing, with the corresponding answer according to the Judge mode, and reinforcement is given according to the Feedback selection while using the comparison and evaluation logic, 20:65-21:21; see also response area, Figure 11); if and only if the first received character is equal to the first character of the keyword and if and only if the second received character is equal to the second character of the keyword, presenting on the display, using the graphical user interface, the first received character in a first font and presenting on the display the second received character in the first font; if and only if the first received character is equal to the first character of the keyword and if and only if the second received character is not equal to the second character of the keyword, presenting on the display, using the graphical user interface, the first received character in the first font and presenting the second received character in a second font (The column headed "Response" is the response of the student to the teacher's request for the direct answer to the question shown in brief. This Response column is color-coded, but for convenience is shown here as follows: italics font instead of green for correct; normal font instead of red for incorrect. If a response is the result of a question whose answer is judged according to the Keyword Mode, and a student's response has not yet reached the keyword, the response would appear in bold or blue. Also, if a question does not have a programmed correct answer, the Response column would be written in bold or blue,

Art Unit: 3715

22:50-23:8; it is understood that the character-by-character response comparison at the time of typing presents the characters in italics if correct and in normal font if incorrect, thus second received character would be displayed in the first font only if it is correct, and in the second font only if incorrect) [Claims 53 & 65].

12. Ziv-El teaches where responses are color coded and font-coded (22:50-23:8); where reinforcement is given in response to a correct or incorrect answer (Mode control data is stored in areas associated with each frame to determine modes of operation within the frame. The Judge Mode group is a class of modes that determines how student responses are to be judged and evaluated. The Judge Modes includes Identical Mode which requires a case insensitive, perfect match between the characters of a student response and those of an answer, Case Sensitive Mode, which requires that any matching must be case sensitive, Match+ Mode, which requires matching only of the first part of a response, Keyword Mode which requires the presence of a particular string within a longer string of characters, and None Mode, which requires no matching to take place. This is followed by mode control data designating various Learning Reinforcement Modes. These modes include Letter-by-letter with mode control data stored in memory area, implying a reinforcement feedback signal on every correct character typed by the student, with a different signal on the last character of a correct response. A Final-letter Reinforcement mode (with mode control data stored in memory area) implies a particular reinforcement feedback signal on the last character of a correct response only, 12:15-39); where reinforcement may be in the form of audio, light, color, or font (Each student computer includes a full alphanumeric keyboard, and a screen and is provided with a speaker or beeper capable of emitting sounds to act as an audio feedback signal for learning reinforcement of the correctness of a response or to alert the student to respond to a teacher's request. A learning reinforcement feedback signal can be either an audio signal from the speaker, or a visual

reinforcement feedback signal, or both. The visual reinforcements signal is provided by a light or a place on the screen, which goes on or flashes in different modes and also acts as a learning reinforcement feedback signal. Also, instead of flashing lights one can use say inverse video characters (i.e. white on black) on the student's screen for correct and normal (black on white) for incorrect, with a flashing cursor when completing a correct response, 6:6-34); and where a student modifies a previously typed answer (The question which was authored into work area appears near the top. The cursor comes to rest in Answer work area. The student is expected to write his or her response to the question there, and the explanation in work area below under Explanation. When the student writes his or her response, which is shown as 'fidgety', the response is compared and evaluated, character-by-character at the instant each character is written, according to the Judge criterion, against the three authored answers in block. At the same time, characters are transmitted as they are being typed to the Response Buffer by means of the Response server. Should the student now click outside the Explanation text entry/display area, the change in X-Y co-ordinates is noted, the cursor is transferred back to the text entry/display area, and the student may proceed to modify the response in text entry/display area, while comparison and evaluation of the response resumes as before, 19:36-62). What Ziv-El fails to explicitly teach is replacing the first received character with the second received character if and only if the first received character is not equal to the first keyword [Claims 53 & 65]. However, replacing incorrect characters with correct characters in a response is understood to be performed by a student modifying the response in the text entry field in reply to the dynamic evaluation. Ziv-El would merely modify detected incorrect characters by replacing them with the most recently typed character when a student is not allowed to proceed typing the response until the next consecutive correct character is input, In order to provide more immediate reinforcement to the student when an incorrect character is typed than when the

entire response is evaluated. To wit, Ziv-El teaches where the student would modify an incorrect character before typing the remaining response. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to allow the replacement of the first received character with the second received character only if the first received character is not equal to the first keyword {incorrect} in the method of Ziv-El, in order to provide color-coded or font-coded feedback to a student as soon as a character is typed, rather than after the entire response has been typed and evaluated [Claims 53 & 65].

13. Ziv-El teaches wherein no characters are entered into the keyboard by the learner in between the first received character entered into the keyboard by the learner and the second received character entered into the keyboard by the learner (the student writes his or her response, which is compared and evaluated character-by-character, 19:36-62). [Claims 53 & 65].

14. Ziv-El teaches wherein the displaying of the first received character in the first font and displaying the second received character in the first font includes displaying a portion of the answer to the question that includes the correct substance of the answer as well as the correct spelling of the answer (Note that the students in seats A2, A6, B1, C2, and C6 have been marked wrong, and the responses are not in italics, but not all for the same reason. The students in seats A2, B1, and C6, are totally wrong. The student in seat A6, has got the right word, but has misspelled fidgety. The student in Seat C2 has not yet completed his response, as is the case of the student in B3, however whereas the B3 student is on the right track of "fidgety", and hence her response is in italics, the student in seat C2 typed a "g" instead of a "d", thereby causing his response to change immediately from italics to the normal font, 23:23-37) [Claims 54 & 66].

15. Ziv-El teaches wherein the displaying of the first received character in the first font and the displaying of the second received character in the first font includes displaying a portion of the answer to the question that includes a substantive word and a non- substantive word [Claims 55 & 67], two substantive words and a non- substantive word [Claims 57 & 69], three substantive words and a non- substantive word [Claims 58 & 70], and wherein the non-substantive word is the word "and" [Claims 56 & 68] (When a question or statement is presented which has missing words which have to be filled in, in a specific order, the Ordered command is selected by the author, as shown in box 150. The Frame is authored by writing the question or statement, complete with the missing words filled in, as shown in the Student Display area 132. The words to be filled in here are "Atlantic, Pacific and African." 20:35-64; It appears that "Atlantic" is a first substantive word, "Pacific" is a second substantive word, "African" is a third substantive word, and "And" is the non- substantive word) [Claims 55-58 & 67-70].

16. Ziv-El teaches wherein the first font has a color that is different from the color of the second font [Claims 59 & 71], wherein the second font is a red font [Claims 60 & 72], wherein the first font indicates that a character displayed in the first font is a correctly entered character [Claim 61], wherein the second font indicates that a character displayed in the second font is an incorrectly entered character [Claim 62], and wherein at least a portion of the answer is displayed in a blue font [Claim 64] (When students respond on their keyboards, their responses are sent character by character in real time to the responses buffer on response server, so that the teacher can observe, virtually character by character, on the monitor, a teacher's class response window showing a large number of students responding simultaneously. The responses appear color-coded, such as green if the student is on the correct track, red for wrong and blue if a response is the result of a question which does not have a programmed

correct answer or the keyword has not yet been typed in a Keyword exercise. Such 'color-coded' responses, which are distinguished one from the other according to effect of the comparison and evaluation logic described, include the idea of a change of fonts like italic and bold, 11:19-35; also, this Response column is color-coded, but for convenience is shown here as follows: italics font instead of green for correct; normal font instead of red for incorrect. If a response is the result of a question whose answer is judged according to the Keyword Mode, and a student's response has not yet reached the keyword, the response would appear in bold or blue. Also, if a question does not have a programmed correct answer, the Response column would be written in bold or blue, 22:50-23:8; it is understood that, in the response, italics font corresponds to green color which represents a correct keyword answer, normal font corresponds to red color representing an incorrect keyword answer, and bold font corresponds to blue color which represents that a keyword has not been found in the response) [Claims 59-62, 64, 71, & 72].

17. Ziv-El teaches wherein the displaying of the first received character in the first font and the displaying of the second received character in the first font occur simultaneously with the displaying of the question and the answer to the question (The teacher's class response window applies to frame of a single lesson, as indicated by (1 lesson) on Response button. The name of the lesson is English 5. The Question/Summary and the Answer(s) remind the teacher of what the authored frame is all about, while the teacher examines the dynamic screen below, as the students are responding, 22:42-49; see also Figure 14; the question/summary, correct answers, and responses are displayed simultaneously) [Claims 63 & 73].

Art Unit: 3715

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 53-73, see pages 8-13, have been considered but are not persuasive.

19. Applicant states at pages 10-11 that if the Ziv-EI system were modified to replace the first received character with the second received character if and only if the first received character is not equal to the first character of the keyword, then the teacher's Response column would be useless to the teacher, hence, the modified Ziv-EI system would not provide any feedback regarding students' incorrect answers to the teacher. However, Examiner's comments are specifically directed to the student's display, not the teachers. See Figure 9 of Ziv-EI. The section quoted in the previous office action, at Column 19:36-62 recites:

The question which was authored into work area 132 in FIG. 8, appears near the top as illustrated in field 172 in FIG. 9. The cursor comes to rest in Answer work area 173. The student is expected to write his or her response to the question there, and the explanation in work area 171 below under Explanation 170. When the student writes his or her response, which is shown as 'fidgety' in FIG. 9, the response is compared and evaluated, character-by-character at the instant each character is written, according to the Judge 138 criterion in FIG. 8, against the three authored answers in block 136 in FIG. 8. At the same time, characters are transmitted as they are being typed to the Response Buffer 51 in FIG. 3a by means of the Response server 6 in FIG. 2. Should the student at any time click his mouse in the Explanation text entry/display area 171 in FIG. 9, the X-Y co-ordinates where clicking has occurred, are transmitted to the Response buffer 51, where the logic ensures that subsequent characters typed appear in the Explanation column of FIG. 14. At the same time, the main part of the comparison and evaluation logic of FIG. 4, for matching of the student response against the authored answer, is not used. Should the student now click outside the Explanation text entry/display area 171, the change in X-Y co-ordinates is noted, the cursor is transferred back to the text entry/display area 173, and the student may proceed to modify the response in text entry/display area 173, while comparison and evaluation of the response resumes as before.

Claims 53 & 65 are directed to what is shown on the learner's or student's display. What is displayed to the teacher is not even in the claims. Examiner's position is that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that a student would attempt to fix his mistake by deleting and retyping the displayed characters of the word in the teaching system of Ziv-EI, because many students learn most effectively by not only receiving immediate feedback, as taught by Ziv-EI, but also by having the opportunity to learn from their mistakes. A routineer in the art would merely allow a student to retype the incorrect character in Ziv-EI to

Art Unit: 3715

correct it, thus reinforcing the corrected spelling letter-by-letter. Thus, Examiner has clarified the argument for Applicant, and finds Applicant's argument concerning feedback to a teacher unconvincing.

20. Applicant further argues at page 11 that the amended limitation overcomes the teachings of Ziv-EI because, as best understood by Examiner, the backspace key is a character typed between a first and second character. However, refer to enclosed Wikipedia entry on ASCII code. Although the Backspace key generates a keyboard scan code and control character, the ASCII control characters including the BS are non-printing characters. Thus, a backspace control character is not a "typed" character as defined in Applicant's specification at Paragraphs 0020-21. Further, a Backspace is not a character in the sense that it would be typed as a letter in a keyword, which Applicant has taken great pains to claim. Typing a backspace is thus understood not to be a character in a keyword, such as a carriage return, delete, or space would be, all of which are also non-printing. Further, it is inherent in Examiner's considerations that no characters would be entered in between the first and second received characters; else they would be properly termed first and third received characters. Furthermore, Ziv-EI teaches a letter-by-letter comparison of the response and the answer, at 19:36-62. Not all characters are letters (e.g. numbers, symbols); thus Ziv-EI discloses analyzing each sequential letter received as it is typed. Thus Applicant's argument is further not convincing.

21. Applicant further cites paragraphs 0020-21 as support for the claim amendments. However, the mere absence of a positive recitation is not basis for exclusion. See MPEP 2173.05(i). In the instant case, the cited paragraphs merely discuss typing alphabetic characters. It is unclear where there is a description, explicit or otherwise, of the decision table found on page 8 of Applicant's arguments. Thus, support for the amendments was not found.

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fujino et al. (US 7,433,646 B2) discloses a learning support method and program in which a server computer selects a learning module in which learning keywords corresponding to subjects that have been learned by a learner, and supplying the module to the learner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nikolai A. Gishnock whose telephone number is (571)272-1420. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30a-5p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan M. Thai can be reached on 571-272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

10/22/2008
/N. A. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 3715

/XUAN M. THAI/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3715